## III.  REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.  By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 14, and 20 have been amended, and no claims have been canceled.  Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter.  Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.  Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-12, and 14-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Eruhimov et al. (US Pat. Pub. 2004/0215591, hereinafter, "Eruhimov"); and claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Eruhimov in view of Schacher (US Pat. 6,002,402, hereinafter, "Schacher").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, but have amended independent claims 1, 11, 14, and 20 without prejudice, to provide improved clarity.  No new matter is believed to be added by these amendments, as support may be found in the specification as filed at [0027], ln. 1-3 and [0030], ln. 4-11, among other passages.

With regard to the rejections of independent claims 1 and 11 under § 102(e), Applicants have amended these claims herein, and respectfully submit that Eruhimov does not teach or suggest each and every claimed feature.  For example, Applicants submit that Eruhimov fails to teach the features of "identifying a user of the user interface" (claim 1, ln. 3; claim 11, ln. 3), and "displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object automatically adjusted based on the identity of the user..." (claim 1, ln. 5-6; claim 11, line 7-8).

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on Eruhimov at [0016-0019] and FIG. 8 to teach "identifying a user of the user interface." Applicants respectfully submit that Eruhimov's FIG. 8 does not include, mention, or refer to a user at all, much less *identifying* a user of the user interface. At [0016-0019], Eruhimov teaches that "a user may use the input/output device" ([0016], ln. 1 (emphasis added)) to "access the actual data or files that the user may wish to retrieve" (*id.*, ln. 4-5 (emphasis added)). Further reference is made to a "user selectable option 24" and "user selectable interfaces" (*See generally*, [0016-0019].) These teachings, however, merely refer to the existence of an anonymous user or potentially interchangeable users. Eruhimov does not teach any method or motivation for *identifying* a specific user of the user interface, or for differentiating between any number of users of the user interface. The *identity* of a user or users does not play a role in Eruhimov's teachings.

With regard to the feature of "displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object automatically adjusted based on the identity of the user," Applicants submit that this feature is also absent from Eruhimov's teachings. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on Eruhimov at [0032] and FIG. 8 to anticipate these features. As noted above, FIG. 8 contains no teachings regarding a user. At [0032], Eruhimov teaches that "in accordance with one embodiment ... software 400 ... automatically generat[es] short-cuts based, at least in part, on the number of times that a particular item in the hierarchy is accessed" (ln. 1-4). "The number of times an item is accessed may be detected at block 415 [of FIG. 8]." (*Id.*, ln. 8-9.) However, those passages, like the balance of the Eruhimov reference, neither teach nor suggest "displaying a plurality of shortcuts for the object automatically adjusted based on the identity of the user." Further, as discussed above, Eruhimov fails to teach a method, system, or program product for

identifying a user, making it impossible for Eruhimov to teach automatically adjusting the displayed shortcuts *based on the identity of the user*.

In view of at least the deficiencies discussed above, and the clarifying amendments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the methods recited in independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Eruhimov. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections under § 102(e).

With regard to the rejections of independent claims 14 and 20 under § 102(e), Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended analogously to, and includes features similar in scope to those already addressed above with respect to claims 1 and 11. (*See*, claim 14, ln. 3, 8-9 ("identifying a user of a user interface"; "automatically adjusted based on the identity of the user, the recorded object operations, and the object..."; claim 20, ln. 4, 8-9 ("identifying a user of a user interface"; "automatically adjusted based on the recorded object operations and the identity of the user").) Further, the Office relies on the same arguments and interpretations of Eruhimov as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 11. (*See* Final Office Action, p. 6, ¶2 and ¶5.) To this extent, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 14 and 20 for the above-stated reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-25, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1, 11, 14, and 20, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. With further respect to claims 10 and 13, Applicants submit that Schacher fails to cure the defects in the Eruhimov reference. Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) to dependent claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-19, and 21-25.

## IV.    CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jayme M. Torelli/
Jayme M. Torelli
Reg. No. 62,735

Date:  August 29, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax:    (518) 449-0047